IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE, ANDHRA PRADESH
AT HYDERABAD

(Special Original Jurisdiction)

FRIDAY, THE TWENTY FIFTH DAY OF FEBRUARY
TWO THOUSAND AND FIVE

PRESENT

THE HON'BLE MR JUSTICE K.C. BHANU

-

WRIT PETITION NO : 3592 of 2005

Between:

K.Hanmanthu s/o K.Yadaiah, aged about 30 years, Occ: Conductor, E.209434 of APSRTC, Rajendranagar Deport, r/o H.No.16-11-611/A, Gaddiannaram, Dilsukhnagar, Hyderabad.

..... PETITIONER

AND

Depot Manager, APSRTC, Rajendranagar Deport, Hyderabad.

.....RESPONDENT

Petition under Article 226 of the constitution of India praying that in the circumstances stated in the Affidavit filed herein the High Court will be pleased to issue a writ, order or direction more particularly one in the nature of Writ of Mandamus directing the respondent either produce the witnesses or furnish the departmental wittiness's addresses with door numbers, lane street and post office in connection with 4 charges framed in the charge sheet No.02/05(68)/2004-RJNR Dt.01.12.2004 framed on the base of two charge Memos No.AO/488187 dt.20.11.2004 of HES/ACPT and Charge Memo No.AO/424828 dt.21.11.2004 of HES/HYD issued by four TTIS, so as to enable the petitioner to produce them in enquiry for recording their statements to prove the charges framed are false and the spot explanation of the petitioner by which the petitioner denied the charges on the spot and incorrect, hence TTIS deliberately violated the instructions of the Corporation issued them through MTD 267.

Counsel for the Petitioner: MR.MOHD.GHOUSEUDDIN

Counsel for the Respondent: MR.V.T.M.PRASAD

The Court at the admission stage made the following:

ORDER:

Challenging the chargesheet dated 01.12.2004 issued by respondent calling for the explanation of the petitioner for the charges specified therein within seven days from the date of receipt of the chargesheet, the present writ petition is filed.

The main contention of the learned counsel for the petitioner is that the names of the passengers and full details have not been furnished. Hence, he prays to set aside the impugned order.

The impugned order dated 01.12.2004 is only a chargesheet calling for the explanation. The authority of the Depot Manager in issuing the charge sheet is not under challenge, and as contended by the learned Standing Counsel for the Corporation, the petitioner can as well submit his explanation thereto. The impugned order does not suffer from any legal infirmity so as to call interference of this Court. If the department wants to rely upon any evidence whether oral or documentary, the full details including door numbers of the witnesses shall be furnished to the petitioner.

The writ petition is accordingly disposed of. No costs.

_____

25.02.2005

VGB

To

1. The Depot Manager, APSRTC, Rajendranagar Deport, Hyderabad.
2. 2CD copies